

REMARKS

In claim 32, the replacement of the limitation “to” with --at-- is to correct a typographical error. Also in claim 32, the replacement of the limitation “to span an area of” with --for placement on-- is to clarify what Applicants regard as the invention. Claim 35 has been rewritten in independent form. Claims 57, 58, 63, and 64 have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejections of these claims moot. No new matter has been added. Because the amendment is submitted in the authorized revised format, the current requirement in 37 C.F.R. 1.121(c) to provide a clean version of the amended claim is believed waived.

I. CLAIM OBJECTIONS / ALLOWABLE CLAIMS

Claims 35-38, 41-44, and 55 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 35 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim, and is believed allowable. As such, claims 36-38, 41-44, and 55, which depend from claim 35, are also believed allowable.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102/103

Claims 32, 33, 39, 40, and 45-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6, 401,719 (Farley). Applicants respectfully note that in order to sustain a rejection under §102, each element in the rejected claim must be found, either expressly or inherently, in the cited reference.

Claim 32 recites a cover that is removably attachable to the probe, and is adapted for placement on the tissue surface over the target region. Farley does not disclose or suggest such

cover. Rather, Farley discloses a catheter 10 having a plurality of electrodes 34 and a covering 80 (Column 22, lines 40-65; Figures 19 and 20). There is nothing in Farley that discloses or suggests that the covering 80 be *removably attachable* to the catheter. In addition, the covering 80 of Farley has a parachute shape for occluding a vein and trapping blood while the electrodes 34 treat a target region distal from the covering 80 (Column 22, lines 40-44 and 61-65; Figures 19 and 20). Therefore, the covering 80 of Farley is not adapted for placement on a tissue surface over a target region.

For the foregoing reasons, claim 32 is believed allowable over Farley. For at least the same reasons that claim 32 is allowable over Farley, claims 33, 34, 39, 40, and 45-54, which depend from claim 32, are also believed allowable over Farley.


CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all remaining claims are believed in condition for allowance. If, the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this amendment, please contact the undersigned at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: 6/17/03

By: 
Gerald Chan
Reg. No. 51,541

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, California 94111
(650) 849-4960